

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

<p>CONSTANCE LORRAINE,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>NORMAN L. WALLIN, <i>et al.</i>,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>3:16-cv-00409-MMD-WGC</p>
<p>SANTANDER CONSUMER USA, INC.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>CONSTANCE LORRAINE,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>3:17-cv-00131-MMD-WGC</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p>

The court has been advised that Plaintiff submitted a summons in *Santander v. Lorraine*, 3:17-cv-131-MMD-WGC (*Santander*), seeking to have the U.S. Marshal serve “Fiat of Reno.” The U.S. Marshal has filed a “Process Receipt and Return” advising that the summons was not executed because no order for service by the Marshal has been entered by the court in *Santander*. (ECF No. 6.)

The Marshal is correct as no service order was entered in *Santander*. It appears to the court Plaintiff is confusing the role, if any, of Fiat of Reno in another case Plaintiff has pending, *Lorraine v. Wallin*, 3:16-cv-409-MMD-WGC (*Lorraine*). Plaintiff recently added Fiat of Reno as a Defendant to the *Lorraine* action. See ECF No. 50.¹ The court presumes Ms. Lorraine meant to have the summons issued for Fiat of Reno in the *Lorraine* action instead of *Santander*.

¹ Plaintiff was permitted to proceed with her amended complaint, adding Fiat of Reno as a Defendant. (ECF No. 50 at 12.) The Clerk was instructed to issue a Summons for Defendant Fiat of Reno and Plaintiff was given twenty (20) days to complete the USM-285 form and return the same to the U.S. Marshal to complete service upon Fiat of Reno.

DATED: March 16, 2017.

2